



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,767	02/18/2000	Craig A. Link	MFCP.68211	8104
45809	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION) 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613			CHARLES, DEBRA F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/506,767

Applicant(s)

LINK ET AL

Examiner

Debra F. Charles

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-5,16-19,23-27, 41-44 have been amended and claims 47-51 have been cancelled.

***Response to Arguments***

2. The examiner notes the amendments to the claims and the term "pre-existing" is obvious.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 ,2,3,4,5,11,15, 16, 32,38, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrat (6085242A), Scott Nesbitt in "Web e-mail services", Link-un, Medford:MA, May/June 1999, Vol. 16, Iss.3', page 24, 1

pages', Adachi (JP071081 19 translated; Hussey (5826269A)., and Kaji et al. (4775956A1).

Re claims 1, 5 and 16: Chandra disclose a method and computer-readable medium

having computer-executable instructions implemented in a computing environment of

producing a unique modified name or second modified name based on a requested

name that has been determined to already exist Abstract, col. 3, lines 5-25), the method

comprising the steps of:

in a computing environment, selecting a word element from at least one list of word elements col. 4, lines 10-33).,

in a computing environment, comparing the modified name with a list of existing names to determine whether the modified name is unique col. 4, Lines 10-63, col. 5, Lines 15-63, col. 6, Lines 5-20)., and in a computing

environment, if the modified name is unique, providing the modified name to the user for acceptance col. 4, lines 50-65, col. 5, lines 15-63).

Chandra discloses) the claimed invention except account name. However, the URL

name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same purpose and

solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have been obvious

to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to get the benefit

of assigning an account name to a URL to make the unique distinction between

separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer generated

name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under the

paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-known

web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system presents the user with a List of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words). For example, if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternate random name generation.

Chandra and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except combining the word

element and at least a stem of the requested name to produce a modified name.

However, in page 2 para 5,6, 7,19-24 and 31 thereof, Adachi discloses) displaying a List

of words and combining word elements to create a file name, and the file name uses the

word combination given to the computer. Further, the reference also indicates any

arbitration or abbreviation of the word can used as the file name. The abbreviation is

effectively the stem of the word. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modiffy the invention of Chandra and SCOQ Nesbitt based on the

teachings of Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is

generating random names and numbers to combine them thereby creating

a unique word regardless of its use as an account name or as a file name

is well-known and is an efficient and speedy method of obtaining unique

account or file names.

Chandra, Nesbitt and Adachi discloses the claimed invention except receiving a requested account name from a user. However, in col. 8, Lines 30-45 thereof, Hussey discloses) an account name filling a field in response to an email message from a server initiated by a user. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt and Adachi based on the teachings of Hussey.

The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to receive an account name from a user more efficiently and effectively.

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi and Hussey discloses) the claimed invention except stem. However, in Abstract, col. 2, Lines 1-15, thereof Kaji et al. disclose stem as a pad of a word. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of



Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey based on the teachings of Kaji et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

Re claim 2: Chandra, Nesbitt, Hussey and Kaji et al. discloses the claimed invention except wherein the word element is randomly selected from the List of word elements. However, in page 2 para 5,6,7,19-24 and 31 thereof, Adachi discloses) displaying a List of words and combining word elements to create a file name, and the file name uses the word combination given to the computer. Further, the reference also indicates any arbitration or abbreviation of the word can used as the file name. It would be obvious to one of ordinal skill in the ad to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott

Nesbitt, Hussey and Kaji et al. based on the teachings of Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is generating random names and numbers to combine them thereby creating a unique word regardless of its use as an account name or as a file name is well-known and is an efficient and speedy method of obtaining unique account or file names.

Re claims 3, 4, 41 and 42: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, and Adachi discloses the claimed invention except adjective, affix, noun and noun stem. However, in Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-15, 1. 3, lines 45-67, thereof Kaji et al. disclose stem, adjective and affix as a part of a word. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, and Adachi based on the teachings of Kaji et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

Re claim 11: Chandra disclose combining word elements to produce a random name;  
comparing the random name with a List of existing names to determine if the random name is unique col. 4, Lines 10-63, col. 5, lines 15-63, col. 6, Lines 5-20), if the random name is unique, providing the name to a user for acceptance col. 4, lines 50-65, col. 5, Lines 15-63).

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, and Kaji et al. discloses) the claimed invention except randomly selecting two further word elements. However, in page 2 para 5,6, 7, 19-24 and 31 thereof, Adachi discloses) displaying a list of words and combining word elements to create a file name, and the file name uses the word combination given to the computer. Further, the reference also indicates any arbitration or abbreviation of the

word can used as the file name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the invention of Chandra, SCO; Nesbitt, Hussey, and Kaji et al.

based on the

teachings of Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is generating random

names and numbers to combine them thereby creating a unique word regardless of its

use as an account name or as a file name is well-known and is an efficient and speedy

method of obtaining unique account or file names.

Re claim 12: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, and Kaji et al. discloses the claimed

invention except combining the requested account name with both an underscore and a

name. However, in paras. 22-24 thereof, Adachi discloses combining names using

underscore and name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, and Kaji et al. based on the teachings of Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the efficiency of creating unique names using various combinations of numbers, letters and other printer marks.

Re claim 32: Chandra disclose receiving an acceptance of the modified account name from the user (col. 4, lines 50-65, col. 5, lines 15-63).

Re claim 38: Chandra, Hussey, Adachi and Kaji et al. discloses the claimed invention except receiving a request to generate an alternate account name from the user.

However, the URL name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the

same purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes.

Thus, it would

have been obvious to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account

name to get the benefit of assigning an account name to a URL to make the unique

distinction between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the requesting

computer generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail

services" under the paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt

discloses a well-known web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up

by inputting a user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is

already taken, the system presents the user with a List of suggested user-ids by creating  
ids that have been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words).

For example, if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest,

steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Hussey, Adachi and Kaji et al. based

on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation to combine these references is to

effectively and efficiently enable alternate random name generation.

6. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kay(U.S. PAT. 6121533A).

Re claim 6: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al.

discloses) the

claimed invention except further comprising the step of producing a unique seeded

name based on the requested name, the unique seeded account name being produced

by: combining the requested name with a numerical seed to produce a first account

name; comparing the first seeded name with the List of existing names to determine

whether the first seeded name is unique', and if the first seeded name is unique.

However, in Abstract, col. 2, Line 55- col. 4, Line 67, col. 21 , Line 20-col. 23, line 20

thereof, Kay discloses using a pseudo-random number generator to create a unique

seeded first name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the



invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al. based on the teachings of Kay. The motivation to combine these references is to generate an output randomly based on input source material where the randomness is controlled in a specific fashion and the randomly generated sequences are repeatable as desired.

Re claim 10: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay discloses) the claimed invention except the steps of combining the requested account name with both an underscore and a name. However, in paras. 22-24 thereof, Adachi discloses combining names using underscore and name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Hussey, Kaji et al., and

Kay based on the teachings of Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the efficiency of creating unique names using various combinations of numbers, letters and other printer marks.

7. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over .

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Ray as applied to claim 6 above,  
and further in view of Larson et al. (U.S.PUB. 2004/0098485A1) and Eric Bach "Efficient Prediction of Marsaglia-Zaman Random Number Generators".

Re claim 7 and 8: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay  
discloses) the claimed invention except wherein the seed is a single digit number, the  
numerical seed is a multi-digit number that is randomly generate and the method further

comprises the steps of incrementing the numerical seed by one if the first seeded

account name is not unique. However, in page 8, para 98 and page 10, para132

thereof, Larson et al. discloses) seed and incrementing numbers. It would be obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi,

Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay based on the teachings of Larson et al. The motivation to

combine these references is that randomized seed is used to generate unique numbers

or a series of numbers and the increment strategy is used to advance the number

sequence forward to ensure unique output.

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al., Kay and Larson et al. disclose(s) the claimed invention except the seed is a single digit number or a multi-digit number. However, in the entire article of Eric Bach thereof, Eric

Bach disclose(s) a random number generator. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al., Kay and Larson et al. based on the teachings of Eric Bach. The motivation to combine these references is to logically increment the random number from one digit to another digit.

8. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al., Kay and Larson et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of McFiggins et al. (U.S. PAT. 3792446A).

Re claim 9: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al., Kay and Larson et al.

discloses) the claimed invention except the steps of generating a second multi-digit

numerical seed if the first seeded account name is not unique. However, in Fig. 3 and

col. 9, Lines 1-67, thereof, McFiggins et al. disclose using random numbers and

incrementing random numbers that have multiple digits to create other random numbers. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of

Chandra, SCOQ Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al., Kay and Larson et al. based on the teachings of McFiggins et al. The motivation to combine these references is to highlight the efficiency inherent in combining various numbers to create multiple unique output from various random numbers.

10. Claims 12, 13 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, and Kaji et al. as applied to claims 1 and

5 above, and further in view of Gu. (5874988A).

Re claims 12,13 and 45: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, and Kaji et al.

discloses) the claimed invention except repeated for up to a predetermined number of

iterations until a result is produced. However, in Abstract, 01. 5, Lines 20-36 thereof, Gu

discloses running a computer program a certain number of times to obtain a specific

output. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, and Kaji et al. based on the teachings of Gu.

The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently obtain a

unique output that fits within a certain criteria.

11. Claim 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay as applied to claim 6 above,

and further in view of Gu (5874988A).

Re claim 14: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay discloses the claimed invention except repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a result is produced. However, in Abstract, col. 5, Lines 20-36 thereof, Gu discloses running a computer program a certain number of times to obtain a specific output. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey, Kaji et al. and Kay based on the teachings of Gu. The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently obtain a unique output that fits within a certain criteria.

1 2. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gabbler et al. (5961593A), Scott Nesbitt and Hussey.

Re claim 17: Gabber et al. disclose a method of producing a unique random name in

response to a request by a user Abstract, col. 3, Lines 25-65, the method comprising:

selecting a first word element from a database including a list of word elements col.

4, Lines 5-25, col. 7, lines 25-55).

in a computing environment, selecting a second word element from the database col. 4, lines 5-25, col. 7, Lines 25-55) ;

in a computing environment, combining the first and second word elements to produce a random name col.6, Lines 1-col. 7, Line 55, col. 9, Lines 1-55).,

in a computing environment, comparing the random name with a List of existing names to determine if the random name is unique col. 8, lines 15-65, and if the random name is unique, providing the random name to the user for acceptance col. 8, Lines 35-63).



Gabbler et al. discloses) the claimed invention except account name and at least one

preexisting List of word elements. However, the name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have been obvious to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to get the benefit of assigning an account name to a registration data set to make the unique distinction between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under the paragraph headed as "a few basics"

on page 1 , Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-known web email site functionality, where

when the user tries to sign up by inputting a user-id, the system checks to see if the

user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system presents the user with a list of

suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been combined with your original id and an

arbitrary numbers) or words). For example, if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmailacom, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It

would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler et al.

based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternately random name generation.

Gabbler et al. and SCOQ Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except receiving a.

requested account name from a user. However, in col. 8, lines 30-45 thereof, Hussey

discloses an account name filling a field in response to an email message from a

server initiated by a user. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

the invention of Gabbler et al. and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Hussey. The

motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to receive an account name from a user more efficiently and effectively.

Re claim 18: Gabbler et al. the first and second word elements are randomly selected from the database col. 4, Lines 5-25, col. 7, lines 25-55).

12. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler et al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Kaji et al.

Re claim 19: Gabbler et al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except adjective and noun. However, in Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-15, col. 3, lines 45-67,

thereof Kaji et al. disclose stem, adjective, affix and noun as a part of a word. It would

be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler et al.,

Hussey and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Kaji et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

13. Claims 20, 21 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler et al., Hussey and SCOQ Nesbitt as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Gu (5874988A).

Re claims 20, 21 and 46: Gabbler et al., Hussey and SCOQ Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a result is produced. However, in Abstract, col. 5, lines 20-36 thereof, Gu discloses)

running a computer program a certain number of times to obtain a specific output. It

would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler et

al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Gu. The motivation to combine

these references is to effectively and efficiently obtain a unique output that fits within a certain criteria.

14. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler

et al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of

Adachi.

Re claim 22: Gabbler et al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention

except combining the requested account name with both an underscore and a name.

However, in paras. 22-24 thereof, Adachi discloses) combining names using

underscore and name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler et al., Hussey and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Adachi.

The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the efficiency of creating

unique names using various combinations of numbers, letters and other printer marks.

15. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler et al. and Scott Nesbitt.

Re claim 23: Gabber et al. disclose computer-readable medium having computer

executable instructions for performing a method of producing a unique random account

name in response to a request by a use Abstract, col. 3. Lines 25-65, col. 5, Lines 25-

60), the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a first word element from a database including a List of word elements col.

4, Lines 5-25, col. 7, Lines 25-55),

selecting a second word element from the database col. 4, Lines 5-25, col. 7, Lines 25-

55, combining the first and second word elements to produce a random account

name col. 6, lines 15-c01. 7, Line 55, col. 9, Lines 1-55),

comparing the account name with a List of existing account names to determine if the

account name is unique col. 8, Lines 15-65)., and

if the account name is unique, providing the account name to the user for acceptance col. 8, Lines 35-63).

Gabbler et al. discloses the claimed invention except account name and at least one

preexisting List of word elements. However, the name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have been obvious to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to get the benefit of assigning an account name to a registration data set to make the unique distinction between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under the paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-known web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system presents the user with a list of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words). For example, if someone tries to sign up as stevehotmail.com, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It



would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of

Chandra,

Hussey and Adachi based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation

to combine

these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternate random

name

generation.

16. Claims 24, 27, 29, 34, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being

unpatentable over Mann et al. (U.S. PAT. 629834181) and Scott Nesbitt.

Re claim 24: Mann et al. disclose a computer-readable medium having

computer-

executable components for producing a unique modified account name

based on a

requested account name that has been determined to already exist

Abstract, col. 3,

line35-col. 4, Line 30, comprising a user interface component for receiving an account name request Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D;  
a database component including a at least one List of word elements and a List of existing account names col. 4, lines 30-55),  
a name generating component for selecting word elements from the at least one List of word elements and combining the word elements with at least the stem of the requested account name to produce modified account names, if the requested account name is not unique when compared to the List of existing account names col. 4, Lines 30-col. 5, Line 25, col. 5, Lines 1-50)., and  
a search component for comparing the modified account names with a List of existing account names to determine whether the modified account names are unique col. 5,

Lines 1-50) and, if the modified account names are unique, providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance col. 6, lines 45-67).

Mann et al. discloses the claimed invention except account name.

However, the

domain name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same

purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have

been obvious to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to

get the benefit of assigning an account name to a domain to make the unique distinction

between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer

generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under

the paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-

known web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system presents the user with a List of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words). For example, if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Hussey and Adachi based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternate random name generation.

Re claim 27: Mann et al. disclose the name generating component randomly selects

the word elements from the at least one List of word elements col. 4, lines 30-col. 5, Line 25).

Re claim 29: Mann et al. disclose the name generating component further produces a

random account name by selecting two further word elements and combining them, the

search component comparing the random account name with the List of existing account

names to determine whether the random account name is unique, and if the random

account name is unique, providing the random account name to the user for acceptance

(col. 4, lines 30-55, col. 5, Lines 1-50, col. 6, Lines 45-67).

Re claim 34: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for receiving an acceptance of one of the modified account names from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D).

Re claim 37: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for receiving an alternate requested account name from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D).

Re claim 40: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for receiving a request to generate an alternate account name from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D).

Re claim 27: Mann et al. disclose the name generating component randomly selects

the word elements from the at least one List of word elements col. 4, lines 30-col. 5, Line 25).

Re claim 29: Mann et al. disclose the name generating component further produces a random account name by selecting two further word elements and combining them, the search component comparing the random account name with the List of existing account names to determine whether the random account name is unique, and if the random account name is unique, providing the random account name to the user for acceptance (col. 4, lines 30-55, col. 5, Lines 1-50, col. 6, Lines 45-67).

Re claim 34: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for

receiving an acceptance of one of the modified account names from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D).

Re claim 37: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for receiving an alternate requested account name from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D.

Re claim 40: Mann et al. disclose wherein the user interface component is also for receiving a request to generate an alternate account name from the user Fig. 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D).

17. Claims 25, 26, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann et al. and Scott Nesbitt as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Kaji et al.



Mann et al. and SCOQ Nesbitt discloses the claimed invention except  
adjectives,

affixes, nouns and noun stems. However, in Abstract, 1. 2, lines 1-15, col.  
3, lines 45-

67, thereof Kaji et al. disclose stem, adjective, affix, noun and noun stems  
as a part of a

word. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the  
invention of Mann et al. and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Kaji et  
al. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer  
system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

18. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Mann et  
al. and SCO/ Nesbitt as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of  
Kay.

Re claim 28: Mann et al. and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention  
except

generating component further produces a seeded account name based on the

requested account name, the seeded account name being produced by combining the

requested account name with a numerical seed, the search component comparing the

seeded account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the

seeded account name is unique, and if the seeded account names is unique, providing

the seeded account name to the user for acceptance. However, in Abstract, col. 2, Line

55- col. 4, Line 67, col. 21 , Line 20-67, col. 23, Line 20 thereof, Kay

discloses using a

pseudo-random number generator to create a unique seeded first name. It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mann et al. based on

the teachings of Kay. The motivation to combine these references is to generate an output randomly based on input source material where the randomness is controlled in a specific fashion and the randomly generated sequences are repeatable as desired.

19. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay,

Evans(U.S. PAT. 6430708 B1), Scott Nesbitt and Ganesan(U.S.PAT. 5588056A).

Re claim 31: Kay disclose a method implemented in a computing environment of producing a unique random output in response to a request by a user  
Abstract, col. 3,

Lines 5-50 and col. 4, Lines 10-25, col. 22, Lines 5-67 Kay discloses the claimed invention except providing without any input or suggestion of names from the user, a List of multiple alternate unique output', and

providing the user with the ability to select any one of said alternate unique output, enter a new string for use as an output or request an automated generation of a new List of multiple alternate unique output. However, in Abstract, 01. 3, lines 40-60, col. 6, Lines 25-67,col. 8, lines 10-61, Fig. 3,4a,4b,5,6, and 9 thereof, Evans discloses generating an output and permitting user modification to the resulting data set, and then re-generating another output based on that data set modification. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Kay based on the teachings of Evans. The motivation to combine these references is to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the resulting output to ensure an unique output.

Kay and Evans discloses the claimed invention except account name. However, the name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have been obvious

to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to get the benefit

of assigning an account name to a registration data set to make the unique distinction

between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer

generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under

the paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-

known web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a

user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken,

the system presents the user with a list of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have

been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words).

For example,

if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest,  
steve0527,

steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of  
ordinary skill in the

art to modify the invention of Kay and Evans based on the teachings of  
Scott Nesbitt.

The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently  
enable  
alternate random name generation.

Kay, Evans and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except  
receiving a

request to generate a unique random account name from a user. However,  
in col. 21,

line 60-col. 22, Line 15 thereof, Gapesan discloses) receiving a request to  
generate a

word. It would be obvious to one of ordinal skill in the art to modify the  
invention of Kay,

Evans and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of Ganesan. The 'motivation to combine these references is the Ganesan reference solves the same problem as the inventor's invention by uniquely generating random words. Eventhough the words are not necessarily account names, they are uniquely generated to provide identification of the user entering data.

20. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler et al., Scott Nesbitt and Hussey as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Chandra.

Gabbler et al., Scott Nesbitt and Hussey discloses) the claimed invention except receiving an acceptance of the random account name from the user. However, in col. 4, lines 50-65, col. 5, lines 15-63 thereof, Chandra discloses) unique names generated by

the computer and suggested to the user by the software of the invention,  
and this

implies that the user can either accept or reject the suggested words. It  
would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler  
et al., Scott

Nesbitt and Hussey based on the teachings of Chandra. The motivation to  
combine these references is the user can easily accept the offered idea  
from the computer software or efficiently and electively reject it.

21. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al. as applied to claim 1  
above, and

further in view of Jim DeRoest, "Hardening AIX Security", SunExnert,  
Brookline: MA,

Sept. 1998, Vol. 9, Iss. 9, pg. 60, 4 pgs.

Re claim 35: Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al.  
disclose the



invention except receiving an alternate requested account name from the user.

However, in the paragraph entitled "A few basics" thereof, Jim DeRoest disclose

enabling the user to select alternative authentication strategies for sign into a computer

network. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi, Hussey and Kaji et al. based on the teachings of Jim

DeRoest. The motivation to combine these references is Jim DeRoest's article shows the user may select alternatives that effectively and efficiently meet the user's preferences if the computer system does not relay alternatives the user likes.

22. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabbler

et al., Scott Nesbitt and Hussey as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Jim

DeRoest, 'Hardening AIX Security, SunExnert, Brookline: MA, Sept. 1998,  
Vol. 9, Iss.  
9, pg. 60, 4 pgs.

Re claim 36: Gabbler et al., Scott Nesbitt and Hussey disclose the  
invention except  
receiving an alternate requested account name from the user. However, in  
the  
paragraph entitled "A few basics" thereof, Jim DeRoest disclose enabling  
the user to  
select alternative authentication strategies for sign into a computer network.  
It would be  
obvious to one of ordinal skill in the art to modify the invention of Gabbler et  
al., Scott  
Nesbitt and Hussey based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The  
motivation to combine  
these references is Jim DeRoest's article shows the user may select  
alternatives that

effectively and efficiently meet the user's preferences if the computer system does not relay alternatives the user likes.

23. Claims 47, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, Adachi and Kaji et al.

Chandra disclose a method implemented in a computing environment of producing a unique modified name or second modified name based on a requested name that has been determined to already exist Abstract, col. b, Lines 5-25), the method comprising the steps of: in a computing environment, selecting a word element from at least one List of word elements col. 4, Lines 10-33)., in a computing environment, comparing the modified name with a list of existing names to determine whether the

in a computing environment, modified name is unique col. 4, Lines 10-63, col. 5, Lines 15-63, col. 6, lines 5-20)., and  
in a computing environment, if the modified name is unique, providing the modified name to the user for acceptance (col. 4, Lines 50-65, col. 5, Lines 15-63).

Chandra discloses the claimed invention except account name. However, the URL  
name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same purpose and  
solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have been obvious  
to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to get the benefit  
of assigning an account name to a URL to make the unique distinction between  
separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer generated

name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under the

paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-known

web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a user-id,

the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system

presents the user with a List of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been

combined with your original id and an arbitral numbers) or words). For example, if

someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004,

etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

the invention of Chandra, Hussey and Adachi based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt.

The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternate random name generation.

Chandra and Scott Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except combining the word element of the requested name to produce a modified name. However, in page 2 para 5,6, 7,19-24 and 31 thereof, Adachi discloses) displaying a List of words and combining word elements to create a file name, and the file name uses the word combination given to the computer. Further, the reference also indicates any arbitration or abbreviation of the word can be used as the file name. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra and Scott Nesbitt based on the teachings of

Adachi. The motivation to combine these references is generating random names and numbers to combine them thereby creating a unique word regardless of its use as an account name or as a file name is well-known and is an efficient and speedy method of obtaining unique account or file names.

Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, and Adachi discloses) the claimed invention except adjective, affix and noun. However, in Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-15, col. 3, lines 45-67, thereof Kaji et al. disclose stem, adjective, affix and noun as a part of a word. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Chandra, Scott Nesbitt, and Adachi based on the teachings of Kaji et al. The motivation to combine these references

is to enable the computer system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

24. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mann et al. (U.S. PAT. 69834181), Scott Nesbitt and Kaji et al.

Re claims 50 and 51: Mann et al. disclose a computer-readable medium having

computer-executable components for producing a unique modified account name based

on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist

Abstract, col.

3, Line35-col. 4, Line 30), comprising:

a user interface component for receiving an account name request Fig. 5A, 58,5C and

5D);

a database component including a at least one List of word elements and a List of



existing account names (col. 4, lines 30-55),  
a name generating component for selecting word elements from the at  
least one List of  
word elements and combining the word elements with at least the stem of  
the requested  
account name to produce modified account names, if the requested  
account name is  
not unique when compared to the List of existing account names col. 4,  
Lines 30-col. 5,  
Line 25, col. 5, Lines 1-50), and  
a search component for comparing the modified account names with a list  
of existing  
account names to determine whether the modified account names are  
unique col. 5,  
lines 1-50) and,  
if the modified account names are unique, providing the modified account  
names to the  
user for acceptance col. 6, Lines 45-67).

Mann et al. discloses the claimed invention except account name.

However, the

domain name indicated is generated in the same way and does serve the same

purpose and solves the same problem as the invention describes. Thus, it would have

been obvious to one with an ordinary level of skill in the art to employ account name to

get the benefit of assigning an account name to a domain to make the unique distinction

between separate data access levels and to efficiently ensure the resulting computer

generated name is unique. Further, in the article entitled "Web e-mail services" under

the paragraph headed as "a few basics" on page 1, Scott Nesbitt discloses a well-

known web email site functionality, where when the user tries to sign up by inputting a

user-id, the system checks to see if the user-id is already taken. If it is already taken, the system presents the user with a list of suggested user-ids by creating ids that have been combined with your original id and an arbitrary numbers) or words). For example, if someone tries to sign up as steveahotmail.com, it will suggest, steve0527, steve2004, etc. to create a unique ID. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mann et al. based on the teachings of Scott Nesbitt. The motivation to combine these references is to effectively and efficiently enable alternate random name generation.

Mann et al. and SCO/ Nesbitt discloses) the claimed invention except adjectives, affixes

and noun. However, in Abstract, col. 2, lines 1-15, col. 3, Lines 45-67, thereof Kaji et al.

disclose stem, adjective, affix and noun as a part of a word. It would be obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mann et al. and Scott Nesbitt based

on the teachings of Kaji et al. The motivation to combine these references is to enable the computer system to use word derivatives to create unique account names.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

17. Claim 30 is allowed.

18. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As per Claim 30.

The prior art of record, specifically Chandra(U.S. PAT. 6085242A), Larson et al.(U.S.PUB. 2004/0098485A1), McFiggins et al. (U.S. PAT. 3792446A), Gu(U.S.PAT. 5874988A), Adachi(JP07108119 translated), Gabbler et al.(U.S.PAT. 5961593A), Mann et al. (U.S. PAT. 698341B1), Kay(U.S. PAT. 6121533A), and Evans(U.S. PAT. 6430708 B1) taken alone or in

combination does not disclose or fairly teach using multiple solution sets to provide at least one unique account name using numerical seed and iteration limit as claimed.

1. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."
2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272 6791. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent A. Millin can be reached on (571) 272 6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Debra F. Charles  
Examiner